

REMARKS

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

Claim 224 has been amended to recite:

obtaining, in respect of each transducer, a delayed replica of each input signal delayed by a respective delay selected in accordance with the position in the array of the respective output transducer and said respective position in space such that replicas for transducers closer to the respective position in space are delayed more than replicas for transducers further from the position in space such that the sound waves of the channel are directed towards the position in space in respect of that channel;

Similarly, claims 232 and 239 have been amended to recite:

replication and delay means arranged to obtain, in respect of each transducer, a delayed replica of the input signal delayed by a respective delay selected in accordance with the position in the array of the respective output transducer and said respective position in space such that replicas for transducers closer to the respective position in space are delayed more than replicas for transducers further from the position in space such that the sound waves of the channel are directed towards the position in space in respect of that input signal;

The purpose of the amendments, which are supported by Figures 16B and 16C of the specification, is to more clearly distinguish the claimed subject matter from the system disclosed in U.S. Patent 5,870,484 (*Greenberger*). Further explanation of the differences between the claimed subject matter and the system disclosed in *Greenberger* is presented below.

WITHDRAWAL OF PREVIOUS REJECTION

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation that the Examiner has withdrawn the previous rejection on the basis of Applicant's remarks submitted March 8, 2007.

RESPONSE TO PRESENT REJECTION

Claims 224 – 231: The Examiner asserts that *Greenberger* anticipates claims 224-231, stating in part that Figure 13A and col. 11, ln. 16-67 through col. 12, ln. 1-2 of *Greenberger* disclose:

obtaining, in respect of each transducer, a delayed replica of each input signal delayed by a respective delay selected in accordance with the position in the array of the respective output transducer and said respective position in space such that the sound waves of the channel are directed towards the position in space in respect of that channel;

[pp. 2-3 of the Action of June 5, 2007]

As supported by Figures 16B and 16C of this application's specification, the delay increases for transducers nearest to the reflective surface; nearer to the point where the beam is directed. The system disclosed in *Greenberger* works in a very different way. As shown in Figure 13A of *Greenberger*, for each signal (e.g. the L signal), one replica is undelayed and output by the L transducer, while another is inverted and delayed and output by the R transducer. Therefore, the signals for transducers closer to the respective position in space are delayed less than the signals for transducers further from the position in space. In short, the device disclosed in *Greenberger* works in the exact opposite way of the method recited in the newly amended claim 224.

Claim 224 has been amended to clearly recite this distinction and therefore should be allowable over the prior art. Likewise, claims 225 through 231 are now allowable because they depend from claim 224.

Claims 232 – 242: The Examiner asserts that *Greenberger* anticipates claims 232-236 and 238-242, and makes obvious claim 237. The Examiner states in part that Figure 13A and col. 57, ln. 50-67 through col. 58, ln. 1-54 of *Greenberger* disclose:

delay means ...arranged to obtain, in respect of each transducer, a delayed replica of each input signal delayed by a respective delay selected in accordance with the position in the array of the respective output transducer and said respective position in space such that the sound waves of the channel are directed towards the position in space in respect of that input signal; [pp. 5 and 7 of the Action of June 5, 2007]

Claims 232 and 239 have both been amended to overcome the anticipation rejections and therefore also place their dependent claims in condition for allowance.

As explained above, the present invention and the system disclosed in *Greenberger* operate in opposite ways. The argument presented above for claim 224 and dependent claims 225 – 231 apply equally to claims 232, and dependent claims 233 – 238 as well as claim 239 and dependents 240 - 242.

With respect to claim 237, which the Examiner rejects as obvious, Applicant points out that the new amendment to claim 232 implicitly adds a limitation to claim 237 that overcomes the Examiner's obviousness rejection.

Applicant submits that the present amendment overcomes all outstanding rejections of claims and further submits that the subject matter of the present claims is not obvious from any of the cited prior art, in that at the time of the present invention, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not have had a reason to modify the prior art apparatus and methods in accordance with the present claims.

CONCLUSION

This is intended to be a complete response to the outstanding Examiner's Action. Applicant submits that the present amendment, in view of the foregoing Remarks, places the case in condition for allowance. A prompt review and Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to phone Applicant's attorney at the phone number given below.

Respectfully submitted:

December 3, 2007

/GerryJayElman/

Gerry J. Elman

Reg. No. 24,404

Scott R. Powell

Reg. No. 58,378

Elman Technology Law, P.C.

Customer no. 003775

Phone: 610-892-9942

efax: 925-226-4995

email: gerry@elman.com